PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

FILE COPY 108

TIMOTHY A. CZAJA DICKE, BILLIG & CZAJA, P.A. TOI FOURTH AVENUE SOUTH SUITE 1250 MINNEAPOLIS, MINESOTA 55415		WRITTEN OPINION (PCT Rule 66) Form PCT/IPEA/408 (cover sheet) (July 1998) DO NOT MAIL			
			Date of Mailing (day/month/year)		
Applicant's or ager A126.106.111	nt's file reference			vithin TWO months rom the above date of mailing	
International appli	cation No.	International filing dat	e (day/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year)	
PCT/US02/2254	4 6	16 JULY 2002		16 JULY 2001	
International Pater Please See Suppl		or both national classif	ication and IPC		
Applicant AUGUST TECH	INOLOGY CORPOR	ATION			
2. This opinion of I X II II III III III III III III III	Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment of Lack of unity of inve Reasoned statement u citations and explana Certain documents ci Certain defects in the Certain observations is hereby invited to r See the time limit in Authority to grant a By submitting a wri For the form and th For an additional op For the examiner's of For an informal com	f opinion with regard to ntion nder Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with tions supporting such so ted e international application on the international application to consider and application to consider and munication with the extension with the extensio	novelty, inventive so he regard to novelty, tatement on olication the content of	guments, see Rule 66.4 bis.	
4. The final date examination re	by which the internate port must be establis	tional preliminary thed according to Rule (39.2 is: 16 NOVEME	BER 2003	

Facsimile No.	Authorized officer AND Telephone No.			
(703) 305-3230	HOA Q. PHAM	(703) 308-4808		

WRITTEN OPINION Form PCT/IPEA/408 (Box I) (July 1998) FILE COPY - DO NOT MAIL

International application No.

I.	Ba	sis of the opinion	
1.	With	regard to the elements of the international application	on:*
	\mathbf{x}	the international application as originally fil	led
	=	the description:	
	X	<u>-</u>	, as originally filed
		pages NONE	, filed with the demand
		pages NONE	, filed with the letter of
		•	
	x	the claims:	
		pages	, as originally filed
		. 9	, as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19
		pages NONE	, filed with the demand
		pages NONE , filed w	vith the letter of
		the drawing:	
	X	_	, as originally filed
		pages NONE	, filed with the demand
		pages NONE	, filed with the letter of
		Pages	
	X	the sequence listing part of the description:	
		pages NONE	, as originally filed
		pages NONE	
	•	pages NONE	, filed with the letter of
		the language of publication of the internation	he purposes of international search (under Rule 23.1(b)). onal application (under Rule 48.3(b)). purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/
3.	With	,	equence disclosed in the international application, the written opinion was
1		contained in the international application in	printed form.
		filed together with the international applicat	tion in computer readable form.
		furnished subsequently to this Authority in v	
		furnished subsequently to this Authority in c	•
	Ш	the statement that the subsequently rumished international application as filed has been furn	written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the hished.
		The statement that the information recorded in cobeen furnished.	omputer readable form is identical to the writen sequence listing has
4.	X	The amendments have resulted in the cance	ellation of:
		X the description, pages none	
		the claims, Nosnone	·
		X the drawings, sheets/fig none	
5.		•	amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go
			e Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)). ceiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to
	ın thi:	s opinion as "originally filed".	

WRITTEN OPINION Form PCT/IPEA/408 (Box II) (July 1998) FILE COPY - DO NOT MAIL

International application No.

п.	Priority							
1.	This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the failure to furnis time limit the requested:	h within the prescribed						
	copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed.							
	translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed.							
This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid.								
Thus	or the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be th	e relevant date.						
3. A	litional observations, if necessary:							
. ,								
•								
		•						
		•						

Form PCT/IPEA/408 (Box III) (July 1998) FILE COPY - DO NOT MAIL International application No. PCT/US02/22546

III.	No	on-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
1. Ti	he q dust	questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be trially applicable have not been and will not be examined in respect of:
		the entire international application.
		claims Nos
		because:
		the said international application, or the said claim Nos. relate to the following subject matter which does not require international preliminary examination (specify).
		·
		·
		the description, claims or drawings (indicate particular elements below) or said claims Nos are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (specify).
]	the claims, or said claims Nos are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.
		no international search report has been established for said claims Nos
		ten opinion cannot be drawn due to the failure of the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing to comply with the standard led for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions:
		the written form has not been furnished or does not comply with the standard.
		the computer readable form has not been furnished or does not comply with the standard.

Form PCT/IPEA/408 (Box IV) (July 1998) FILE COPY - DO NOT MAIL International application No.

IV.	Lack of unity of invention						
1.	In response to the invitation (Form PCT/IPEA/405) to restrict or pay additional fees the applicant has:						
	restricted the claims.						
	paid additional fees.						
	paid additional fees under protest.						
	neither restricted nor paid additional fees.						
2.	2. This Authority found that the requirement of unity of invention is not complied with for the following reasons and chose, according to Rule 68.1 not to invite the applicant to restrict or pay additional fees:						
	-						
	·						
3.	Consequently, the following parts of the international application were the subject of international preliminary examination in establishing this opinion:						
	all parts.						
	the parts relating to claims Nos						

Form PCT/IPEA/408 (Box V) (July 1998) FILE COPY - DO NOT MAIL International application No.

statement			
Novelty (N)	Claims	5, 7-13, 16-20	YE
	Claims	1-4, 6, 14, 15	NO
Inventive Step (IS)	Claims	5, 7-13, 16-20	YE
*	Claims	1-4, 6, 14, 15	NO
Industrial Applicability (IA)	Claims	1-20	YE
	Claims	NONE	NO
citations and explanations			
features using an optical microscope in which beam splitter is a pellicle beams splitter, ho time the invention was made to replace the equivalent in function, a substitute for one of Regarding claim 5, Corle et al team (75) includes one pinhole having an association.	ch a beam splitt wever, it would beam splitter o of another is rec ch that rotary d ted individual m	have been obvious to one having ordification of Corle et all by a pellicle beam splitter ognized as being within the level of clisk (51) is two dimensional array and icrolens (77), see figure 3.	explicitly teach that the nary skill in the art at the r because they are ordinary skill in the art. a further aperture array
features using an optical microscope in which beam splitter is a pellicle beams splitter. ho time the invention was made to replace the equivalent in function. a substitute for one of Regarding claim 5, Corle et al team (75) includes one pinhole having an associate Claims 7-13, and 16-20 meet the criteria set suggest that "the camera reimager is telectriculudes an illuminator with a filament designumerical aperture stop and reimaged into the elevation of the surface using gaussian curve each pixel" (claim 16).	ch a beam splitted wever, it would beam splitter of another is reach that rotary died individual must out in PCT Anotheric on the side gned to proved the telecentric p	er (57, 59) is used. Corle et al do not have been obvious to one having ordif Corle et al by a pellicle beam splitter ognized as being within the level of click (51) is two dimensional array and icrolens (77). see figure 3. Tricle 33(2)-(4), because the prior art defacing the intermediate focus" (claim a quasi uniformly luminous area that it upil of the object imager" (claims 9 ar	explicitly teach that the nary skill in the art at the because they are ordinary skill in the art. a further aperture array oes not teach or fairly 7), "the light source is internally imaged into a and 11) and "measuring the
features using an optical microscope in which beam splitter is a pellicle beams splitter. ho time the invention was made to replace the equivalent in function. a substitute for one of Regarding claim 5, Corle et al team (75) includes one pinhole having an associate Claims 7-13, and 16-20 meet the criteria set suggest that "the camera reimager is telecer includes an illuminator with a filament designumerical aperture stop and reimaged into the elevation of the surface using gaussian curve each pixel" (claim 16).	ch a beam splitted wever, it would beam splitter of another is reach that rotary died individual must out in PCT Anotheric on the side gned to proved the telecentric p	er (57, 59) is used. Corle et al do not have been obvious to one having ordif Corle et al by a pellicle beam splitter ognized as being within the level of click (51) is two dimensional array and icrolens (77). see figure 3. Tricle 33(2)-(4), because the prior art defacing the intermediate focus" (claim a quasi uniformly luminous area that it upil of the object imager" (claims 9 ar	explicitly teach that the nary skill in the art at the because they are ordinary skill in the art. a further aperture array oes not teach or fairly 7), "the light source is internally imaged into a and 11) and "measuring the
features using an optical microscope in which beam splitter is a pellicle beams splitter. ho time the invention was made to replace the equivalent in function. a substitute for one of Regarding claim 5, Corle et al team (75) includes one pinhole having an associate Claims 7-13, and 16-20 meet the criteria set suggest that "the camera reimager is telecer includes an illuminator with a filament designumerical aperture stop and reimaged into the elevation of the surface using gaussian curve each pixel" (claim 16).	ch a beam splitted wever, it would beam splitter of another is reach that rotary died individual must out in PCT Anotheric on the side gned to proved the telecentric p	er (57, 59) is used. Corle et al do not have been obvious to one having ordif Corle et al by a pellicle beam splitter ognized as being within the level of click (51) is two dimensional array and icrolens (77). see figure 3. Tricle 33(2)-(4), because the prior art defacing the intermediate focus" (claim a quasi uniformly luminous area that it upil of the object imager" (claims 9 ar	explicitly teach that the nary skill in the art at the because they are ordinary skill in the art. a further aperture array oes not teach or fairly 7), "the light source is internally imaged into a and 11) and "measuring the
features using an optical microscope in which beam splitter is a pellicle beams splitter. ho time the invention was made to replace the equivalent in function. a substitute for one of Regarding claim 5, Corle et al team (75) includes one pinhole having an associate Claims 7-13, and 16-20 meet the criteria set suggest that "the camera reimager is telecer includes an illuminator with a filament designumerical aperture stop and reimaged into the elevation of the surface using gaussian curve each pixel" (claim 16).	ch a beam splitted wever, it would beam splitter of another is reach that rotary died individual must out in PCT Anotheric on the side gned to proved the telecentric p	er (57, 59) is used. Corle et al do not have been obvious to one having ordif Corle et al by a pellicle beam splitter ognized as being within the level of click (51) is two dimensional array and icrolens (77). see figure 3. Tricle 33(2)-(4), because the prior art defacing the intermediate focus" (claim a quasi uniformly luminous area that it upil of the object imager" (claims 9 ar	explicitly teach that the nary skill in the art at the because they are ordinary skill in the art. a further aperture array oes not teach or fairly 7), "the light source is internally imaged into a light and "measuring the
features using an optical microscope in which beam splitter is a pellicle beams splitter. ho time the invention was made to replace the equivalent in function. a substitute for one of Regarding claim 5, Corle et al team (75) includes one pinhole having an associate Claims 7-13, and 16-20 meet the criteria set suggest that "the camera reimager is telectriculudes an illuminator with a filament designumerical aperture stop and reimaged into the elevation of the surface using gaussian curve each pixel" (claim 16).	ch a beam splitted wever, it would beam splitter of another is reach that rotary died individual must out in PCT Anotheric on the side gned to proved the telecentric p	er (57, 59) is used. Corle et al do not have been obvious to one having ordif Corle et al by a pellicle beam splitter ognized as being within the level of click (51) is two dimensional array and icrolens (77). see figure 3. Tricle 33(2)-(4), because the prior art defacing the intermediate focus" (claim a quasi uniformly luminous area that it upil of the object imager" (claims 9 ar	explicitly teach that the nary skill in the art at the because they are ordinary skill in the art. a further aperture array oes not teach or fairly 7), "the light source is internally imaged into a and 11) and "measuring the
features using an optical microscope in which beam splitter is a pellicle beams splitter. ho time the invention was made to replace the equivalent in function. a substitute for one of Regarding claim 5, Corle et al team (75) includes one pinhole having an associate Claims 7-13, and 16-20 meet the criteria set suggest that "the camera reimager is telectriculudes an illuminator with a filament designumerical aperture stop and reimaged into the elevation of the surface using gaussian curve each pixel" (claim 16).	ch a beam splitted wever, it would beam splitter of another is reach that rotary died individual must out in PCT Anotheric on the side gned to proved the telecentric p	er (57, 59) is used. Corle et al do not have been obvious to one having ordif Corle et al by a pellicle beam splitter ognized as being within the level of click (51) is two dimensional array and icrolens (77). see figure 3. Tricle 33(2)-(4), because the prior art defacing the intermediate focus" (claim a quasi uniformly luminous area that it upil of the object imager" (claims 9 ar	explicitly teach that the nary skill in the art at the because they are ordinary skill in the art. a further aperture array oes not teach or fairly 7), "the light source is internally imaged into a and 11) and "measuring the

Form PCT/IPEA/408 (Box VI) (July 1998) FILE COPY - DO NOT MAIL International application No.

COMMITTED THE PROPERTY OF THE	ule 70.10)		•	
Certain published documents (R Application No. Patent No.	Publication Date (day/month/year)	Filing Date (day/month/year)	Priority date (valid clai (day/month/year)	
N '' 1' 1 '' ''	YO 0)			
Non-written disclosures (Rule ?			Date of written disclosure	
Kind of non-written disclosure		n-written disclosure /month/year)	referring to non-written discloss (day/month/year)	
	•			
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			

Form PCT/IPEA/408 (Box VII) (July 1998) FILE COPY - DO NOT MAIL International application No.

VII. Certain defects in the international application The following defects in the form or contents of the international application have been noted:								
						٠		
·								
			•			•		
					•			
		·						

Form PCT/IPEA/408 (Box VIII) (July 1998) FILE COPY - DO NOT MAIL International application No.

vm.	Certain obser	rvations o	n the internat	ional applicat	ion		 	
The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:								
	•	•						
				•				
•					·			
					•			
			•					
						•		

Form PCT/IPEA/408 (Supplemental Box) (July 1998) FILE COPY - DO NOT MAIL International application No.

PCT/US02/22546

Supplemental B	OX
----------------	----

(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)

Continuation of: Boxes I - VIII

Sheet 10

TIME LIMIT:

The time limit set for response to a Written Opinion may not be extended. 37 CFR 1.484(d). Any response received after the expiration of the time limit set in the Written Opinion will not be considered in preparing the International Preliminary Examination Report.

CLASSIFICATION:

The International Patent Classification (IPC) and/or the National classification are as listed below: IPC(7): GO1N 21/00; G02B 21/00; G06K 9/62; H04N 7/18 and US Cl.: 356/237.2, 237.4; 359/368; 348/126